



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/785,862	02/16/2001	Rocky Stewart	BEAS-01033US6 SRM/KFK	6339
23910	7590	06/14/2004	EXAMINER	
FLIESLER MEYER, LLP FOUR EMBARCADERO CENTER SUITE 400 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111			LIN, WEN TAI	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2154	

DATE MAILED: 06/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/785,862

Applicant(s)

STEWART ET AL.

Examiner

Wen-Tai Lin

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 February 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 February 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5-6, 10-11</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-20 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-3, 5-13 and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chaar et al.[U.S. Pat. No. 5960404].
4. As to claim 1, Chaar teaches the invention as claimed including: a workflow integration system for a collaboration system that allows for sharing of workflow information between collaboration participants [e.g., sharing the same work list among multiple performers; claim 21], comprising:

Art Unit: 2154

- a collaboration server having stored thereon an enterprise workflow [1230, 765, Fig.12; col.14, line 59 - col.15, line 12];
- a workflow server having stored thereon a participant workflow [630, 620, Fig.12]; and
- an integration mechanism for allowing said enterprise workflow and said participant workflow to interact with one another [Abstract; col.4, lines 26-31; col.12, lines 32-54].

5. As to claim 2, Chaar further teaches that the enterprise workflow includes workflow process information for an enterprise project including two or more participants [i.e., Performer 1 and 2, Fig.16].

6. As to claim 3, Chaar further teaches that the participant workflow includes workflow process information for a project local to the participant [610, 630, Fig. 12].

7. As to claim 5, Chaar further teaches that the enterprise workflow [120, 130, Fig. 1] includes at least one process flow lane [140, 150, Fig. 1] for each active participant, and the action of the workflow is determined by messages sent to and received from each of said active participants or a process flow lane of said active participant.

8. As to claim 6, Chaar further teaches that the enterprise workflow sends and receives messages directly from the participant [col.3, lines 54-56].

Art Unit: 2154

9. As to claim 7, Chaar further teaches that the enterprise workflow sends and receives messages from the participant workflow [col.4, lines 3-7].

10. As to claim 8, Chaar further teaches that the enterprise workflow sends and receives messages from the participant workflow via a collaboration enabler authorized to communicate with the collaboration server [130, 110, Fig.16].

11. As to claim 9, Chaar further teaches that said integration mechanism allows the enterprise workflow to modify an active participant workflow process [col.19, lines 13 - 32].

12. As to claims 10-13 and 15-20, since the features of these claims can also be found in claims 1-3, 5-9, 11 and 15, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-3, 5-9, 11 and 15 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claims 4 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chaar et al.(hereafter "Chaar")[U.S. Pat. No. 5960404], as applied to claims 1-3, 5-13 and 15-20 above.

15. As to claims 4 and 14, Chaar does not specifically teach the enterprise workflow is stored in the collaborative server and that the enterprise workflow and the participant workflow may interact through exchange of XML data.

However, Chaar et al. taught that a special-purpose performer takes the role of collaborating work distribution among a plurality of task performers, wherein each performer is also a workflow server containing a workflow template repository [e.g., 1230, Fig. 12, or 1310, Fig. 13A]. It is obvious that, in order to keeping track of all the participants' statuses, the collaborative server must have a workflow repository containing copies of the enterprise and participant workflow.

Further, Chaar et al. taught that the task request and response could be transferred as mailed messages using Internet protocol [col.22, lines 9-16]. Thus it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that XML or HTML are obvious document formats for the exchange of workflow information.

16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Notani [U.S. Pat. No. 6119149];

Art Unit: 2154

Flores et al. [U.S. Pat. No. 6073109];

Boden et al. [U.S. Pat. No. 5930512]; and

Cloud et al. [U.S. Pat. No. 5634127].

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wen-Tai Lin whose telephone number is (703)305-4875. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-5:00) .

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (703)305-8498. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:


(703)872-9306 for official communications; and

(703)746-5516 for status inquiries draft communication.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3900.

Wen-Tai Lin

June 10, 2004


6/10/04